

The Honorable Robert S. Lasnik

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

SUSAN SOTO PALMER, et. al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STEVEN HOBBS, et. al.,

Defendants,

and

JOSE TREVINO, ISMAEL CAMPOS,
and ALEX YBARRA,

Intervenor-Defendants.

Case No.: 3:22-cv-05035-RSL

Judge: Robert S. Lasnik

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO
STATE OF WASHINGTON'S
STATUS REPORT**

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this response to State of Washington's Status Report to this Court, Dkt. 225, and Non-Party Legislators' Statement in Response to Court Order, Dkt. 227. Plaintiffs agree that the Court ought to "allow[] legislative efforts to continue for the full period originally allotted by the Court's decision in this case." Dkt. 227 at 4. However, in light of the State of Washington's contention that the Commission is unlikely to be reconvened, Plaintiffs propose that the parties proceed with a dual-track approach.

Plaintiffs propose that the Court continue to provide the Legislature its allotted time to reconvene the Commission should doing so become politically feasible. However, rather than waiting for that time to elapse before accepting alternative remedial proposals, Plaintiffs propose

1 that the Court set earlier deadlines for both the parties and interested nonparties to file their
 2 proposals in the interim. This will ensure that the Court has alternative remedial proposals in hand
 3 and ready for its consideration by January 8, 2024 should the Legislature fail to reconvene the
 4 Commission and/or transmit an approved map by that deadline.¹

5 Accordingly, Plaintiffs propose the following amended schedule for the parties to file
 6 alternative remedial submissions:
 7

8 December 1, 2023: Deadline for parties and non-parties, including amici curiae, to
 9 submit remedial proposals,² supporting memoranda, and exhibits
 (including expert reports)

10 December 22, 2023: Deadline for parties and non-parties, including amici curiae, to
 11 submit briefs and rebuttal expert reports in response to remedial
 proposals

12 January 5, 2024: Deadline for parties and non-parties, including amici curiae, to
 13 submit replies to the responsive briefs and sur-rebuttal expert reports

14 Regarding the State's suggestion to appoint a special master, Plaintiffs believe that doing
 15 so is not necessary for the Court to select an appropriate remedy in this matter. As the Court
 16 envisioned in its Memorandum Opinion, if the Legislature fails to reconvene the Commission, the
 17 Court can consider and select from the parties' alternative remedial submissions, which will
 18

19
 20 ¹ In the instance that the Legislature does reconvene the Commission and transmit an approved
 21 map by the January 8, 2024 deadline, Plaintiffs request that the parties be given 14 days to respond
 22 with memoranda and exhibits, including expert reports, regarding the legality of that map and
 whether it remedies the VRA violation.

23 ² So that the parties, nonparties, their experts and the Court can adequately review and analyze the
 24 remedial proposals, each remedial proposal shall include with the filing the following: zoomable
 pdf of the map boundaries that includes important roadway and geographic markers as well as
 25 voting precinct boundaries. The filing shall also include demographic data, including total
 population per district and race by district of total population and citizen voting age population.
 26 Contemporaneous with the filing, all counsel of record shall be provided shapefiles, a comma
 separated value file, or an equivalent file that is sufficient to load the proposed plan into commonly
 available mapping software.

1 include additional expert analysis and “supporting memoranda and exhibits for the Court’s
 2 consideration.” Dkt. 218 at 32. The Court also has the benefit of a trial record that includes
 3 exhaustive analysis of several potential remedial districts. Unlike *Singleton*, this case involves a
 4 single state legislative district and does not require the sort of judicial line-drawing across the state
 5 that might necessitate a special master. Nevertheless, if the Court intends to appoint a special
 6 master, Plaintiffs request that they be given an opportunity to propose appropriate experts for the
 7 Court to consider and that the Court consider engaging a special master only to assist in the
 8 assessment of proposed plans. If the special master is ordered to go beyond assisting the Court in
 9 evaluating plans, and also to prepare plans for the Court’s adoption, Plaintiffs request that they be
 10 given an opportunity to comment on those plans prior to the Court’s entering of a final remedial
 11 order.
 12

13 Dated: October 3, 2023

14 By: /s/ Edwardo Morfin

15 Chad W. Dunn*
 16 Sonni Waknin*
 17 UCLA Voting Rights Project
 18 3250 Public Affairs Building
 19 Los Angeles, CA 90095
 20 Telephone: 310-400-6019
 21 Chad@uclavrp.org
 22 Sonni@uclavrp.org

Edwardo Morfin
 WSBA No. 47831
 Morfin Law Firm, PLLC
 2602 N. Proctor Street, Suite 205
 Tacoma, WA 98407
 Telephone: 509-380-9999

23 Mark P. Gaber*
 24 Simone Leeper*
 25 Aseem Mulji*
 26 Benjamin Phillips*
 Campaign Legal Center
 1101 14th St. NW, Ste. 400
 Washington, DC 20005
 mgaber@campaignlegal.org
 sleeper@campaignlegal.org
 amulji@campaignlegal.org

Annabelle E. Harless*
 Campaign Legal Center
 55 W. Monroe St., Ste. 1925
 Chicago, IL 60603
 aharless@campaignlegal.org

Thomas A. Saenz*
 Ernest Herrera*
 Leticia M. Saucedo*
 Erika Cervantes*
 Mexican American Legal Defense
 and Educational Fund

bphillips@campaignlegal.org

*Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for Plaintiffs

643 S. Spring St., 11th Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90014
Telephone: (213) 629-2512
tsaenz@maldef.org
eherrera@maldef.org
lsaucedo@maldef.org
ecervantes@maldef.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that all counsel of record were served a copy of the foregoing this 3rd day of October, 2023 via the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Edwardo Morfin

Edwardo Morfin
WSBA No. 47831
Morfin Law Firm, PLLC
2602 N. Proctor Street, Suite 205
Tacoma, WA 98407
Telephone: 509-380-9999